



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,401	04/12/2004	Luigi P. Tozzi	502558	2893

23626 7590 05/03/2005
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD
6815 WEAVER ROAD
SUITE 300
ROCKFORD, IL 61114-8018

EXAMINER

ARGENBRIGHT, TONY MICHAEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3747

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/822,401

Applicant(s)

TOZZI ET AL.

Examiner

T. M. Argenbright

Art Unit

3747

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,7,8,12,22,24,25,27,37 and 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,5,6,9-11,13-21,23,26 and 28-36 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/6/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There is no antecedent for "the at least one induction orifice". It appears that dependency should be from claim 23.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Raichle et al. In column 4, lines 21-47, Raichle et al discloses detecting start of combustion when the ionic current exceeds a predefined value.

Art Unit: 3747

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Dyne et al. In column 5, lines 28-39 Van Dyne et al discloses that combustion duration is indicated by the period of time the ionic current is above a threshold value. In this case, the claimed first and second thresholds are the same.

Claims 1, 4, 22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Linder et al. In Figures 11 and 14, and column 10, lines 19-38, Linder et al discloses ion current sensor 55 having electrodes 56/1 and 56/2 disposed on insulating plate 37/1". The plate and electrodes are shrouded or shielded by plates 37/2" and 37/3" and the outer threaded shell of the plug.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hammarberg. Hammarberg discloses a fuel injector having an ionic sensor 9, 10 clamped between the bottom of the injector and the engine head. The sensor is thereby integrally attached to the injector and protected from fuel spray by the surrounding head.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linder et al in view of Kemmler et al. Linder et al discloses a spark plug for an ignition system having an integral ion current sensor. Kemmler et al teaches using the output of an ion current sensor attached to a spark plug as an input to a spark control and driver module 14. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the spark plug of Linder et al in an ignition system having a spark control module responsive to the ion current provided by the integral sensor, as taught by Kemmler et al.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nomoto (Japan 63-215878) in view of Linder et al. Nomoto discloses a method of starting a diesel engine using multiple sparks. A separate spark plug 12 and ignition sensor 13 are provided in the combustion chamber. Linder et al teaches providing a spark plug with an integral combustion sensor. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nomoto to use a spark plug with integral combustion sensor, such as that of Linder et al, to simplify component mounting and reduce the number of separate system parts.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 9-11, 13-21, 23, 26 and 28-36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 24 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion


The ignition arrangements made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to T. M. Argenbright whose telephone number is 571-272-4837. The examiner can normally be reached M-Th 6:30am-3:00pm and alt. Fridays 6:30am-2:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Yuen can be reached on 571-272-4856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3747

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


T. M. Argenbright
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3747